



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the necessity for any degree of diligence whatever is not expressly set forth. A sworn copy was admitted after effort had been made to procure the original in *Fisher v. Greene*, 95 Ill. 94, but the Court do not state whether such preliminary effort was essential. In *Phillips v. United States Benevolent Society*, 125 Mich. 186, the cases are reviewed and the conclusion arrived at that diligence to procure the original must be pursued, and if the efforts prove fruitless a sworn copy must be produced when it is practicable to do so.

**GUARDIAN AND WARD—LIABILITY ON BONDS—GENERAL AND SPECIAL BONDS.**—Suit on a guardian's general bond against the surety thereon. The defendant set up in answer that part of the amount claimed consisted of the proceeds from a sale of the ward's real estate, upon which sale a special sales bond had been given. A demurrer to the answer was sustained, and defendant assigns this ruling as error. *Held*, the demurrer was properly sustained. The special sales bond was merely cumulative security and did not release the general bond from liability to account for such proceeds. *Southern Surety Co. v. Burney et al.*, (Okl. 1912) 126 Pac. 748.

The holding in the principal case seems to be against the numerical weight of authority. Massachusetts, Maine, New York, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Indiana, and Nevada hold that the special bondsmen *only* are liable to account for the proceeds of a sale of the ward's real estate where such a special sales bond is required and furnished. *Mattoon v. Cowing*, 13 Gray, 387: *Judge of Probate v. Toothaker*, 83 Me. 195, 22 Atl. 119: *Allen v. Faye*, 63 N. Y. Supp. 1031: *Blauser v. Diehl*, 90 Pa. 350: *Com. v. American Bonding Co.*, 212 Pa. St. 365, 61 Atl. 939: *State v. Peterman*, 66 Mo. App. 257: *Colburn v. State*, 47 Ind. 310: (but see dictum in *Yost v. State*, 80 Ind. 350); *Henderson v. Coover*, 4 Nev. 429. The rule in Iowa is also contrary to the principal case, but the difference may be accounted for by the difference in the statutes of the two states. See *Madison County v. Johnston*, 51 Iowa 152, 50 N. W. 492. Kentucky, Mississippi, and Texas seem to be in accord with the principal case. *Barker v. Boyd*, 24 Ky. L. Rep. 1389, 71 S. W. 528; *State v. Cox*, 62 Miss. 786; *Fidelity and Deposit Co. v. Schelper*, 37 Tex. Civ. App. 393, 83 S. W. 871. Florida makes the general bond primarily liable. *Hart v. Stribling*, 21 Fla. 136. West Virginia, on the other hand, makes the special bond primarily liable. *Findley v. Findley*, 42 W. Va. 372, 26 S. E. 433: (but see *Kester v. Hill*, 42 W. Va. 611, 26 S. E. 376). Ohio holds the two bonds jointly liable. *Swisher v. McWhinney*, 64 Ohio St. 343, 60 N. E. 565. It is submitted however that the decision in the principal case is best calculated to protect the interest of the ward.

**INSURANCE—RATIFICATION BY INSURED, AFTER LOSS, OF POLICIES PROCURED BY AGENT WITHOUT AUTHORITY.**—The president of a corporation, without authority from the corporation, secured from the defendant a fire policy in the name of the corporation covering certain of its goods. After a loss and with knowledge thereof, the corporation ratified the act of its president. In a suit against the insurer to enforce the policy, *Held*, (LACOMBE, J., dissenting) that the ratification bound the insurance company and recovery could be had. *Marqusee v. Hartford Ins. Co.* (C. C. A., 1912), 198 Fed. 475.